Panel Questions Set 2

Please address these questions, no more than 2-3 slides per question.

1. We would like a walkthrough of the change control process. Can you please provide a graphic and a couple of real world scenarios at the 10k, 50k, 270k, and $1.5 M change level. Indicate how OL would interact with IO components, NSF, and OL Advisory Panels with respect to large change orders.

2. Data policy calls out proprietary use in 2 areas.

•   For commercial use defined as generated by privately funded data sources with commercial purposes; this data may be deemed proprietary and may carry usage fees". Please provide some scenarios of how this might work. What if the scientific community wants access to these data.

•   An exclusive use period defined as

"Individual PIs who have developed a data source that becomes part of the OOI network may have exclusive rights to the data produced by that data source for a period of no more than one year from the onset of the data stream. The period of exclusive access must be approved in each case by the OOI Facility Governance Group. After the exclusivity limit, the historical data as well as the current stream from the individual PI data source will be made publicly available under the policy described for core and community data." Leaving this decision to the OOI Facility Governance Group seems ad hoc. Consider a proprietary use period should be included into the individual PI proposal to NSF and left to the peer review process to decide if the propriety use warrants funding. We would like OL comment on this issue.

•   What is the definition of the start of data flow?

3. The Science Plan calls out "Data will be made publicly available to users through a general web interface, and through distribution to data archives, including the national data repositories (e.g., National Geophysical Data Center, National Oceanographic Data Center, and National Buoy Data Center)." Please elaborate more on the form, function, and extensibility of the web interface.

4. MREFC reviews consistently highlight the need for diversity in staff of NSF funded programs how the program is increasing diversity of Ocean Programs. Do you have any concrete plans in this area. What is your hiring plan?

5. How does education fit into program management in the Project Office and integrate with science and engineering management at the IOs? What is the reporting mechanism for E&O at the OL level?

6. NEPA compliance is a major milestone for receiving MREFC funding. What is the risk management plan for making sure this item is completed and not a critical path issue. Which permits, by IO, would stop the forward progress of the project. With less than 6 months to go this seems like a critical problem. Coastal Zone Management Act could be a real problem because state offices act independently and autonomously. How would a 3-6 month delay in NEPA compliance impact the project. Who is responsible for bringing this whole package together?

7. How were the costs for O&M derived, how are they tied to the MREFC deliverables, and are they in the WBS and Cost Book? Please provide examples from each IO. What is the staffing plan for O&M transition.

8. For global and costal nodes the development of the vertical profilers seems to be a risk. Can the OL provide a risk analysis and provide suggestions on how to make this a less risky endeavor.

9. What is the plan (profile) for spending contingency. What is the process for reallocating contingency once a risk is retired. What is the projection of when they would spend contingency?

10. If there's no schedule contingency, how are permitting activities and associated potential slips in system accommodated? Not an area where contingency funds can be used.

11. How will the IO's and their subawardees use the EVM tools to manage the project?

12. The issue of who holds contingency and how it is included in the resource loaded schedule is confusing. This morning's discussion appeared to indicate that contingency is distributed among the IO's from the outset of the project, and that earned value reporting includes distributed contingency in the planned value. Please clarify that the baseline performance plan does NOT include contingency and that it is centrally held by the Project Director at OL, for distribution through a Configuration Control Process that involves the PM's of the IO's and requires NSF concurrence for changes above threshold amounts (defined in a CA for construction).

13. Scope of the CI IO: Matt Arrott said that the CI IO workscope stops before the interface to the embedded software and data acquisition in the sensors. Yesterday, Matt gave this visionary talk about dynamic response of the network to an "event." That implies a close association between the embedded software systems and Matt's high level data acquisition, display, and archival. How will the OOI management team affect this vision? The worry is that the interfaces between the network and the front end software will be perceived as having to be supported out of the "other guy's" budget. This also relates to the previous question - is there contingency available to OL to resolve these gaps in the interfaces between the OI's? One could ask for the pros and cons of the current working relationship between UCSD, UW, and WHOI, and JOI, and whether some other tiering arrangement would provide a more seamless integration, for example: UCSD as a subawardee to both UW and WHOI, or the reverse - UW and WHOI as subawards from UCSD.

14. Please tell us more about your collection of user requirements input, e.g. which community groups have you worked with already, which are in the queue.

15. This is a large scale software development (and/or integration) project (for an NSF-funded operational research system.) Please tell us what sanity checks for cost, effort, schedule, e.g. against other similar projects of similar scope you have done.

16. Please show us how you will craft your implementation so that it dovetails well with other large NSF projects. For instance, can a global climate modeler group use OOI as one of 1/2 a dozen (or more) "sensor inputs" to a real-time GCM?

17. What existing software technologies have you considered/evaluated?

18. The interface documents for the internal systems seems good. We would like to understand some additional details about the science user interface.

19. Where are the evaluation points in the spiral cycles and how are they done? What have you evaluated so far?

20. Has prototyping of any of the CI been done? Is it planned?

21. Can you explain what synergies there might be with other major NSF-funded long-term data efforts (outside of OOI.)

22. Can you explain to us the functionality of the first two (CI) deliverables?